



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,184	10/30/2003	Asaf Adi	IL920030025US1	8188
877 7590 01/26/2010 IBM CORPORATION, T.J. WATSON RESEARCH CENTER P.O. BOX 218 YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598				
EXAMINER CHUMPTIAZ, BOB R				
ART UNIT 3629		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 01/26/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

iplawyor@us.ibm.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/697,184

Applicant(s)

ADI ET AL.

Examiner

BOB CHUMPITAZ

Art Unit

3629

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/5/2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 8-10 and 27-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-7, 11-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 8-10 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a Non-Final Office action in response to communication received January 5, 2010. Claims 28-31 have been added. Therefore, claims 2-4, 8-10 and 27-31 are pending and addressed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 8, 27, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. (US 2003/0055695 A1, hereinafter Mori) in view of Etzion et al. (US 6,604,093 B1, hereinafter Etzion) and in further view of Keller et al. (US 6,847,970 B2, hereinafter Keller).

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in

accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

As per claims 27, 28 and 30, Mori discloses a method and system for processing information, comprising:

“in a system comprising one or more processors, providing an active dependency integration unit, comprising a first program module that receives as input first events for processing together with a definition of dependencies between business components in a business model in order to monitor a propagated impact between the business components”; “receiving as input in the active dependency integration unit events relating to business components in the business model, for processing together with a definition of dependencies among the business components in order to monitor a propagated impact of the events among the business components, including receiving a first event relating to a first business component” and “receiving as input in the active dependency integration unit events relating to business components in the business model, for processing together with a definition of dependencies among the business components in order to monitor a propagated impact of the events among the business components, including receiving a first event relating to a first business component; responsively to the first event and to the dependencies, propagating a second event indicative of a change to at least a second business component, wherein the dependencies between the first business component and the second business component comprise a compound dependency having two different simple dependency types” (Abstract: inputting dependency related tasks; [0009-10] project management method and apparatus

comprising an inputting means for inputting tasks (work items) of a project; memory means for storing a dependence relation among tasks; memory means for storing information about an output of each task; process model generation means for generating a process model having the dependence information among the task and the information about the task output and the resource; see also Claim 7 and associated text).

Mori does not expressly disclose “providing in the system a situation awareness unit, comprising a second program module that detects situations comprising specified combinations of second events and conditions”; “detecting in the situation awareness unit situations comprising specified combinations of events and conditions relating to a business model, the conditions comprising an order of occurrence and temporal relationships among the events” and “detecting in the situation awareness unit situations comprising specified combinations of events and conditions relating to a business model, the conditions comprising an order of occurrence and temporal relationships among the events.” However, Etzion teaches a situation awareness system that comprises tools and systems for situation management (col. 3, lines 21-37) and applies filtering techniques to detect situations (col. 2, lines 44-65; see also col. 8, lines 36-56). Furthermore, Etzion teaches wherein the method for situation management includes specifying a composite event as a combination of two or more predefined component events and defining a rule, which causes a reaction to be invoked upon an occurrence of the composite event subject to a given condition (Abstract; see also col. 9, lines 59-61 and Claim 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify the process model, having information representing dependence relations among tasks, of Mori to include the process of providing situation awareness management tools as taught by Etzion in order to detect and invoke a situation awareness reaction upon an occurrence of the composite event subject to a given condition.

Mori further discloses “receiving in the active dependency integration unit a first event relating to at least a first business component” ([0003] Design Structure Matrix (DSM) is a project management method that expresses the tasks involved in one project in a matrix form, mutual dependencies relations among the tasks are put into the corresponding positions of the matrix so that the input/output relations among the tasks can be clearly expressed; [0025] dependency relation from the input task “merchandise concept generation” to the output task “car construction decision”; see also Claim 1 and associated text).

With respect to: “responsively to the first event and to the dependencies, propagating a change to at least a second business component”; “responsively to the first event and to the dependencies, propagating a second event indicative of a change to at least a second business component, wherein the dependencies between the first business component and the second business component comprise a compound dependency having two different simple dependency types”; “responsively to the first event and to the dependencies, propagating a second event indicative of a change to at least a second business component, wherein the dependencies between the first business component and the

second business component comprise a compound dependency having two different simple dependency types” and “passing a second event indicative of the change to the situation awareness unit”; “passing the second event to the situation awareness unit”; “passing the second event to the situation awareness unit” and “responsively to the second event, detecting a situation in the situation awareness unit”; “responsively to the second event, detecting a situation in the situation awareness unit”; “responsively to the second event, detecting a situation in the situation awareness unit” and “responsively to the situation, conveying a third event from the situation awareness unit to the active dependency integration unit”; “responsively to the situation, conveying a third event from the situation awareness unit to the active dependency integration unit”; “responsively to the situation, conveying a third event from the situation awareness unit to the active dependency integration unit” and “outputting a functional state of the business model responsively to at least the third event”; “outputting a functional state of the business model responsively to at least the third event”; “outputting a functional state of the business model responsively to at least the third event” Mori discloses generating a process model having dependence information among multiple tasks [0010].

Furthermore, Mori discloses when the replacement of a task occur the dependence relation of the task sequence changes respectively [0026]. Additionally, Etzion teaches wherein the method for situation management includes specifying a composite event as a combination of two or more predefined component events and defining a rule, which causes a reaction to be invoked upon an occurrence of the composite event subject to a given condition (Abstract; see also col. 9, lines 59-61 and Claim 1). Lastly, Keller teaches

methods and apparatus for managing dependencies in distributed systems techniques for managing information in a computing environment which is enabled to detect and determine changes in the dependency model (col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Mori/Etzion combination to include the process propagating change to at least a second business dependent component in a dependency model as taught by Keller in order to modify dependent components in a business model when changes occur therefore creating and updating a functional dependency model accordingly.

As per claims 2-4, the Mori/Etzion/Keller combination disclose claim 27 as rejected above, where Etzion further teaches "receiving as input event types, business component types, and dependency types associated with a business domain"; "receiving as input rules that describe how a given event affects a specified business component" and "receiving as input rules that describe when a change in a business component triggers an event" (Abstract: specifying a composite event as a combination of two or more predefined component events and defining a rule, which causes a reaction to be invoked upon an occurrence of the composite event subject to a given condition; see also col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 5: events input).

As per claim 8, the Mori/Etzion/Keller combination disclose claim 27 as rejected above, where Etzion further teaches wherein the definition includes predefined dependency type semantics (Abstract: Abstract: specifying a composite event as a combination of two or more predefined component events and defining a rule, which causes a reaction to be invoked upon an occurrence of the composite event subject to a given condition; see also col. 2, lines 55-59 predefined relations; col. 3, lines 21-38 predefined component events).

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori/Etzion/Keller in view of H. Herbst, G. Knolmayer, T. Myrach and M. Schlesinger: "The specification of business rules: A comparison of selected methodologies" (Pub. 1994, hereinafter Herbst) and in further view of Nye (US 6,341,279 B1).

As per claims 9 and 10, the Mori/Etzion/Keller combination disclose claim 8 as rejected above, and with respect to: "wherein said dependency type semantics include a mandatory logical operator that logically couples one or more source components of the dependency to one or more targets of the dependency and sets the targets to a worst state of the source components" and "wherein said dependency type semantics include an "N out of M" logical operator, wherein N is less than M, that logically couples M source components of the dependency to one or more targets of the dependency and sets the targets to ok if at least N of the source components are ok and otherwise sets the targets to "fail"'" Mori discloses the process of representing dependence relationships from an input task to an output task [0025-27]. Additionally, Herbst teaches a conceptual modeling approach which supports triggering events, (synchronized) operations and resulting events, and where an operation consists of one or more tasks that are based on management rules and are executed sequentially, and where every operation may lead to different events according to issuing rules which may be e.g. be 'operation has been successful' or 'operation has failed': the abbreviation NR signifies that no response follows (Pg. 6, Section 3.1.2). In addition, Herbst teaches data modeling formalism, PN are augmented with token values to specify constraints concerning object state sequences generated by events and object type dynamics in databases (Pg.6, Section 3.1.4, see also Fig. 4 and associated text). Lastly, Nye

teaches a method that allows a developer to add complex dependency logic to an existing database without having to modify the underlying structure of the database, where each event in the event model has an associated event type and contains dependency logic that interrelates the events in the event model with one another (Abstract & col. 5, lines 33-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Mori/Etzion/Keller combination to include logical dependent rule transactions as taught by Herbst and complex dependency logic as taught by Nye in order to formulate one or more issues arising in a business plan using logical reasoning techniques to identify options relating to the business plan.

Claims 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori/Etzion/Keller in view of C. Gill, T. Harrison, and C. O'Ryan "Using the real-time event service" (hereinafter Gill).

As per claims 29 and 31, the Mori/Etzion/Keller combination disclose claims 28 and 30 as rejected above, but do not expressly disclose "where wherein the simple dependency types are a mandatory dependency and a disjunctive dependency." However Gill teaches event dependency modeling, with conjunction and disjunction correlations (Pgs. 1, 16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Mori/Etzion/Keller combination to include disjunctive sets of dependency events as taught by Gill in order to provide one or more types of dependency modeling types whenever logical disjunction operations are required so that to evaluate data dependency outputs.

Please Note:

Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

Applicant(s) are reminded that optional or conditional elements do not narrow the claims because they can always be omitted. See *e.g.* MPEP §2106 II C: “Language that suggest or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. “As a matter of linguistic precision, optional elements do not narrow the claim because they can always be omitted.” *In re Johnston*, 435 F.3d 1381, 77 USPQ2d 1788, 1790 (Fed. Cir. 2006)(where the Federal Circuit affirmed the Board’s claim construction of “further including that said wall may be smooth, corrugated, or profiled with increased dimensional proportions as pipe size is increased” since “this additional content did not narrow the scope of the claim because these limitations are stated in the permissive form ‘may.’ ”).

Functional recitation(s) have been considered but given less patentable weight because they fail to add any steps and are thereby regarded as intended use language. A recitation of the intended

use of the claimed invention must result in additional steps. See *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Laboratories, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1368, 1375-76, 58 USPQ2d 1508, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 5, 2010 are moot in view of the new ground of rejections. See rejection above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BOB CHUMPITAZ whose telephone number is (571)270-5494. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TR: 7:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN WEISS can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-6494.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

B. C.
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/JOHN G. WEISS/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629